

FINISHED COPY

DECEMBER 11, 2014

2:00 P.M. CST

IMLS

NATIONAL LEADERSHIP GRANTS FOR
LIBRARIES

FEBRUARY DEADLINE
APPLICANT WEBINAR

Services Provided By:

Caption First, Inc.

P.O. Box 3066

Monument, CO 80132

1-877-825-5234

+001-719-481-9835

Www.captionfirst.com

This text is being provided in a rough-draft Format. Communication Access Realtime Translation (CART) or captioning are provided in order to facilitate communication accessibility and may not be a totally verbatim record of

the proceedings.

>> Recording started.

>> Good afternoon. This is Robert Horton from the Institute of Museum and Library Services. Welcome to our webinar to introduce you to the notification of funding opportunities for the National Leadership Grants program.

We are just getting under way. If you have any kinds of concerns about the technical issues, please take a look at this slide, which will give you some information about how to download, how to stay in touch, how to contribute and participate. And as it notes, we are going to use chat for the questions and answer period at the end of the presentation. So you can enter a question at any time. We will keep track of those. But we won't address them until we get to the end of the slides.

Let's get under way. Brief background on the Institute of Museum and Library Services. It's the primary source of federal support for the nation's 123,000 libraries and 35,000 museums. We do a whole variety of activities. We are a grant-making institution. That is probably how you know us best. But we also convene groups, conduct research, and publish in order to build the capacity of museums and libraries to serve the public.

There are a variety of resources available on our website, IMLS.gov, that I urge you to look at. They will be extremely valuable help, as you develop a proposal for the National Leadership Grant program. I put a few screen shots on the slides that you can follow up on, but if you go to IMLS.gov and you look at the grants that we have awarded in the past, that is an invaluable way of determining what sort of things we are interested in. What sort of things we have already funded, and in terms of an application, that we are going to build on, or enrich, enhance or explore our activities, this is the key way to find out what's been undertaken in the past.

As well, and absolutely critical for the development of a proposal, is the Notification of Funding Opportunities. Those are listed as well in our website. There is a different set of guidelines or as we call them, Notification of Funding Opportunity, NOFO, for every specific program. These change over time. Even if you have applied and received grants from the IMLS in the past, you don't want to rely solely on that experience. Those forms are on those instructions from years past, because for a variety of reasons IMLS has to, from time to time, change priorities, change practices, change forms.

So you want to make sure you understand what the most current Notification of Funding Opportunity is,

follow that closely, read it closely and pay attention to all that we are required to ask of you in order to review and fund a proposal.

So again, that is the Notification of Funding Opportunities, listed on-line. Make sure you see the most recent one. What is new about the IMLS and the National Leadership Grant program this year?

There is a couple different things you need to keep in mind. Both the appearance of the Notification of Funding Opportunities, and the process for reviewing grant applications has changed. A lot of the motivation of that is the Office of Management and Budget has introduced something that is what we call a super circular. It has consolidated, and integrated and clarified a variety of different federal regulations that were all over the Code of Federal Regulations, and determining how federal grant making activities were conducted. So those have been brought together and refined. And those have some significant impacts on our practices.

The overall goals of the grant reform were simplification, making the process easier, consistency, making agencies follow similar practices across their individual programs, and across agencies. So things are familiar to those of you who are looking at a variety of different agencies, so that we are not having disparate approaches to grant making and grant

reviewing. And last but not least, transparency, so the whole entire process is better explained, and our activities and decisions are better understood.

One immediate impact of OMB grant reform was a change in terminology. What we formerly called guidelines are now Notification of Funding Opportunity, and I'll probably use the acronym NOFO in the course of the presentation. In the past if you have looked for program guidelines in order to develop a proposal, now you want to make sure you understand and find the Notification of Funding Opportunity.

As well in terms of changing on a process, the Office of Library Services within the past year has hosted a number of convenings, three in fact, that looked at engaging our community and talking to our constituencies about a number of priorities that the agency wanted to support.

And for this Notification of Funding Opportunity, there are identified two program goals or project categories, the national digital platform and learning spaces that are recommended as priorities for the funding of National Leadership Grant. You will hear a little more about that later on in the presentation. But you want to make sure that you understand what happened in those convenings, what material was

discussed, how the program goals and project categories were defined, and how they might apply to your proposal.

We have also had a change which we have just tested in an earlier cycle, earlier grant cycle, and which we are now planning to implement again in this round of National Leadership Grant programs, where instead of asking initially for a full proposal, that is all the components that we have traditionally requested from applicants of budgets and narratives and letters of support, etcetera, which were fairly burdensome process, fairly burdensome requirement, instead we are moving towards a two-phase project.

What we are asking for initially is that preliminary proposal, rather short, of two pages, that will go through an external review and then we will make decisions about whom to invite to submit full proposal. I'll explain more about that in detail. But this is a kind of preview of coming attractions, in the sense that these are all the different issues and processes that have been changed over the past year, and which you need to be aware of.

I think I skipped one.

No. Sorry.

Where to find basic information, if you go to our website, WWW.IMLS.gov, and follow the link on this

slide, and again you can download this entire presentation, if you want to use that as a set of reference notes, if you go to that link on the slide, what you will get to is the National Leadership Grant program Web Page. That will give an overview of the entire program, what we are trying to achieve, what our priorities are. It will link to staff contact information and of course, we urge you to contact staff with any questions at any time in the process, any help we can provide to develop a better application to help you work through a proposal process is something we really want to do. We would much rather talk to you before a proposal is made, at a time when we can help you, than afterwards, when we can send our regrets.

The contact information is valuable. There is also going to be a link to the NLG Notification of Funding Opportunity, which again will give you the exact details of what you need to do in order to submit a proposal in this program. And last is the link to notes from the convenings so that you will be able to look and see what we have discussed, what our constituents have recommended, what our communities have talked about with us in relation to our program goals.

It's critical that you understand eligibility rules. These are fairly broad, and I won't go through all the details. But, you want to understand if you are in fact

a eligible institution, if you have any questions please do contact us beforehand. Talk to a program staff officer, program specialist, so that we can help you through those questions, because of course it will save you a lot of time if in fact you are not an eligible applicant, you don't need to go through the application process and find out again later that there is no way we can review your proposal or make an award to you.

You can also benefit from talking to us in the sense that we can suggest possible ways where a partner can be found. So here are some specific examples of groups that are not eligible to be a primary applicant, federally funded institution, for-profit organization, a individual, a foreign country or organization. But, we receive numerous proposals and we make numerous grants where those types of organizations or individuals are partners and benefit from proposals in various ways. The primary application -- primary applicant has to be eligible partners, participants, consultants, members of advisory boards, etcetera, can be ineligible institutions. Contact us with any questions.

One of the decisions you will have to make as you start to explore the proposal is what category of funding you want to work under. We have four financial form grants. Project grants, which are

normally about implementation, development of a new tool, outreach to a new community, enhancement of existing applications, etcetera, those projects, you can request up to \$2 million. Similarly for research grants where you are looking at an issue of significant importance, you can request up to \$2 million. We have a planning grant category which is very useful, if you are interested in an idea but you are not ready to go to a project grant or research grant, you are not ready to dive into the deep end, so to speak, but you want to see if there are available partners, or if there is a community interest, or if you understand all the options, planning grant can be up to \$50,000. Similarly, national forum grant which is to a certain extent a more elaborate or planning grant on steroids, where you are talking about involving and engaging a much larger group of participants in a community exploration of a particular idea, that can be a grant of up to \$100,000.

I'll talk about this later on as well. But it's good to mention in this context, that all the programs have rules about indirect costs, and for research grants that request any amount of money, there is no obligation or I'm sorry, not indirect cost, for research grants -- oops, what happened here?

Okay. Sorry, excuse me. For research grants up to any amount, you are not obligated to provide any

matching contribution. My apologies for mentioning direct cost. That is a different issue. For research grants up to any amount, no match is required. For any project where, whether it's a project grant or any grant application whether it's project grant, research, planning, national forum grant, anything where the request from the IMLS is under \$250,000, a match is not required.

So, do keep that in mind. If, however, you are requesting a project grant for an amount over \$250,000, a one-to-one match is required. There are two project categories or funding priorities that were developed out of our convening our national digital platform, and learning spaces in libraries. The latter is now, includes a lot of references to STEM, science, technology, engineering and math which was a focus of a third convening we had. But we have determined that STEM is very often a subject addressed within the larger context of learning spaces in libraries, so we have consolidated our two funding priorities to those, national digital platform, learning spaces in libraries. I'll talk in detail about both of those.

What I want to stress though is that you are not obliged or required in this funding cycle to propose a project that falls into one or the other of these things. We will accept applications that explore the following

issues regardless of whether they apply to the national digital platform or learning spaces in libraries.

Questions you want to be able to answer are, what is going to move library and archival services in the United States forward, what will help libraries and archives make decisions about their own investments, what knowledge, capacity, functions or infrastructure can libraries and archives share. It covers a wide variety of ground.

But the single most important criterion you want to address as you develop the proposal in any of these areas, whether it's national digital platform, learning spaces or whatever category you are deciding on, is impact. We are looking for projects that are going to have a broad impact. That makes for a more competitive proposal.

Here is information, discussions on the national digital platform that we have had. I won't read it in its entirety but it's taken directly from our notification of funding opportunity. It's clarified, expanded upon and discussed in great detail in the notes and transcripts from our national digital platform convening. Again I urge you to take a close look at that.

Please note, though, that proposals that focus on training and development of librarians in this context, in this area around these subjects, should be

submitted to the Laura Bush 21st Century Grants Program, which is an entirely different program that focuses on education and training for librarians and archival professionals. Take a look at the national digital platform, make sure you distinguish between a proposal that says we want to do something that falls within this category, instead of we want to do something that trains people to do something in this category. The latter is going to be more of a Laura Bush 21st Century Grants Program application.

Learning spaces, this is well discussed in our convening around learning spaces in STEM. Please note that it does include the discussions about STEM, for the reasons I mentioned earlier. This again is taken directly from a Notification of Funding Opportunity. It's clarified and discussed at great length in the notes and transcripts from the two convenings. Again, if you are talking about training and development of librarians in this context or around these subjects, you really want to look to a Laura Bush 21st Century Grant Program instead of national leadership.

The process, what do you have to do in order to be able to get a LG grant? What do you need to have started and get under way in the next couple months? Our preliminary proposal is due on February 2. That

is a drop dead deadline, so to speak, because we will not be able to accept a proposal submitted after the deadline. Make sure you are planning your proposal development with that in mind.

And very often, we have instances where applicants need to submit proposals to development officers or offices of sponsored research, for approval beforehand. That can be time-consuming. But you need to adjust your schedule in order to account for that. Our schedule, unfortunately, by statute and OMB regulation, is hard and fast. We must have the application by the deadline of midnight Eastern Standard Time on February 2.

What you need to include, the preliminary proposal is going to be no more than two pages. We won't read anything more than two pages, in order to have a fair and equitable process to make sure that everybody's proposal is treated in the same way. Please follow the rules about those carefully. They are described in the Notification of Funding Opportunity. I'll talk more about them later.

We are not accepting any attachments. The preliminary proposal of two pages is all that you have to describe your idea. Along with that, though, there are a number of other documents that we absolutely need to have. These are all required documents. The

form SF424, which is available through grants.gov, which is the delivery mechanism, the submission mechanism for proposals, is a necessary component, as is the program information sheet, which is described and available through the Notification of Funding Opportunity. We will need all of those components, absolutely required; cannot review proposals that are incomplete.

Everything has to go through grants.gov. That we will discuss more later. But understand as well that grants.gov is not part of the IMLS. And a variety of activities and tasks that you need to undertake in order to be able to submit proposals through grants.gov take place outside the purview of the IMLS. So you need to have all that in place. We are not able to help you, especially not able to help you at the last minute, because we have no control over grants.gov.

Once we receive the proposal, we go through an eligibility and completeness check, make sure that you are in fact a eligible applicant, that we received all the necessary and required components, and then at that point we send out the proposals for outside external review.

We have an evaluation process, that culminates in a panel meeting of all the proposals we received. Comments are generated for all proposals. Admittedly there is going to be more comments for the proposals

for which we are inviting the applicant to submit a full proposal. But we do plan to provide comments for all applicants.

If you are invited, to submit a full proposal, that full proposal will be due on June 1. Again, that is a hard and fast deadline. Same reasons I explained earlier, it has to go through grants.gov. I won't go into great detail about that, but all the information is in the Notification of Funding Opportunity, and if you are invited to apply for full proposal, one of the processes we recommend that you contact us immediately to talk about the full proposal so that we can walk you through that process.

So, when you are looking at the full proposal or the preliminary proposal, I'm sorry, and determining how you are going to squeeze an elaborate and sophisticated idea two pages, admittedly it is going to be a challenge. What we can say with assurance from having gone through one cycle already with this process is that it can be done and can be done successfully. What you can do is review the documentation from the meetings and convenings, if you are looking at one of our two funding priorities, research the issues that are identified as critical, because that is going to help you develop a credible application.

If you are not looking at a proposal that addresses

one of the two funding priorities, you still want to do the research, because what you are trying to demonstrate is what you are looking at is an issue for which a lot of different libraries and archives are looking for answers, and that the result, the outcome of your proposal, your project, is going to have a significant and broad impact. This is in fact a National Leadership Grant program. National and leadership are two critical qualifiers you want to keep in mind.

Work with other professionals to develop a practical and collaborative response to issues that have been defined. Make sure you have a number of sets of eyes looking at this proposal. Make sure you identify the project director and partners. Because we are going to be interested in capacity, can in fact demonstrate what you are able to do the things that you want to do, outline the proposed work plan, and that is a very brief outline obviously. Show the relevance to one of the two program priorities and its potential impact, or any of the potential impact, sorry, that seems to have bullet slipped, identify your projected outcomes, what are going to be the results, why is this going to be important? Why in a very competitive situation is this something that is worth funding?

Let me stress the competitive nature of this. There

is a fairly small percentage of applications that are funded, simply because there is a tremendous demand for our funds, and not enough funding to do all the good things that we would like to do.

You want to provide an estimated budget. You don't want to go into the details of the budget. You don't have to talk about indirect cost rates, you don't have to talk about a match. You do have to understand what your obligations for a match are going to be because if you ask for a million dollars and we ask you to submit a full proposal, you are going to be expected to show that you can provide a million dollars worth of match.

But anyway, for the preliminary proposal, you are just telling us what your requests from the IMLS is going to be, what if you have invited to move forward how much funding are you going to request.

Successful applications, again, we are looking for national or professional impact. You want to address the goal that is going to further the work of the librarians and archives in the United States. We want in-depth knowledge. You should reflect, your proposal should reflect that you know what you are doing, you understand what is out there. You made conscious choices about the options and opportunities. And you are going to demonstrate some results, that you are going to show that you are actually going to deliver a

set of products or produce some outcomes that are really going to fulfill the goals which you set.

When we look at these, I should say when our reviewers look at these because it's essentially the external reviewer who are going to be making recommendations about the preliminary proposals and in another set of reviews about the full proposals, these are the kind of questions they are going to ask. Are you looking at priorities? Are you referencing discussions and recommendations from the convenings? Or if you are not looking at one of the two priorities, are you doing similar work, are you referencing information or sources that indicate that what you are looking to do is of critical concern to our professional communities? Do you know what people are doing? Are you building on what people are doing? Is it innovative? Is it progressive? Is it going to have an impact? And making sure, again, that you are talking about explicit outcomes or products.

The other aspect that is critical to the review is project management capacity, because you can have a wonderful idea, but in fact, we very often see ideas that are proposed for institutions that don't always demonstrate the capacity to achieve those goals.

So you really want to talk about practicality, you want to talk about cost effectiveness. If you are promising to create a model, you should understand

that a really attractive model to the IMLS is one that makes things easier for people to do, simpler for people to do, cheaper for people to do, a development of a model in a one million dollar project that basically indicates you need a million dollars from IMLS to replicate it doesn't necessarily move other institutions forward.

So look at the cost effective aspects of what you want to do. Can you measure impact and value? All federal funding agencies are expected to demonstrate essentially the returns on their investments. Are we achieving our goals as an agency through our investments in your proposals? We need to be able to look at the metrics and performance measurements that you are providing, in order to be able to justify our own budgets. Those are critical. Where applicable, are you addressing our digital stewardship policy? I urge you to take a close look at that form because we are asking questions related to intellectual property rights, preservation and access of content.

We have a very broad, as do all federal funding agencies, very broad definition of digital content. You want to make sure you fully understand what the policies that are coming out of the administration are relating to open data, open government, open resources, how they apply to your proposal. Impact is

often a function of collaboration, correct is a function of collaboration. Efficiency and cost effectiveness is a function of collaboration. You want to make sure that if you have partners when needed, and those are the right partners, and can you demonstrate the appropriate project management skills and capacity? I'm going to stress the qualifier, appropriate here, because there is a big difference in applying for, say, a \$50,000 planning grant and asking for \$1.5 million project implementation grant. If you are looking at a project of the latter scale, you really want to be able to show you can manage a project of that size, you have experience and capacity there. And that it's something that promises effective completion within the work plan that you are going to provide.

So, in the second phase, we will have reviewed all of the preliminary proposals. We will invite a percentage of the applicants to submit a full proposal. And again it's difficult to say what percentage will be invited. In our past cycle which is our first experience with this process, we had roughly about 110 applications, and we invited 20-some to submit a full proposal.

An invitation to submit a full proposal is no guarantee of funding. We still need to examine all the

components, all the plans, all the budgets, and there will be a second round of external review that will determine which awards are actually made.

So, we will extend, as I said, invitations to submit a full proposal. But please don't construe that as a automatic check coming your way. You still have to submit a full proposal. That full proposal is explained in the Notification of Funding Opportunities. It will be due on the first of June. Again, you will have to go through grants.gov with all the implications and consequences grants.gov has. We will have an external review after we go through the eligibility and completeness check, make sure that all the required components of the grant are there, grant proposal are there. Again we can only review full and complete proposals with all the required components.

We will make an award notifications in September, 2015. Grants could start in October, November or December, all on the first, October 1, November 1, December 1.

Your deadline, again for the preliminary proposal is the 2nd of February, 2015. Grant periods can last for up to three years for project or research grants, one year for planning grants and national forum grants. Projects may begin no earlier than October 1, 2015. They must start in the calendar year 2015. So December 1, 2015 is when they must start.

As noted there, cost share requirements, to repeat what I mentioned earlier, you must provide cost sharing if at least 1/2 of the total project cost, that is a one-to-one match, but cost sharing is not expected for research projects no matter what the amount of request is, or applications for grants under \$250,000.

So, whatever the category, if it's under \$250,000, we do not expect a match. If it's a research grant, of whatever amount requested, we do not expect a match. We will not take a match into consideration during the review for either of those situations as well. If you do note in your budget and proposal that you are going to provide a match, you will be required to meet that match. So very carefully consider what you are promising. This in a certain sense is a contractual obligation that you are making. If you propose a match, you must provide it and document that match in the course of your reports during the project period.

So, please take that into account, and please don't think that an extravagant match is going to help in the review process. Very often it simply makes us think that that is going to be very difficult to achieve. It is going to be incredibly difficult to document. It can raise some credibility questions about your experience and capacity. If you are obliged to provide a match, be very careful about what you are proposing and recognize that you are going to have to provide it.

So, some tips. As I mentioned, grants.gov is in completely outside of the purview of the IMLS. But you are required to submit proposals through it. Here are some things that you absolutely have to have in place in order to do that. You need a DUNS number. And you also have to be registered in what is called a system award management application, Sam.gov. Both of those are required components, in order to be able to submit a grant. Grants.gov will reject proposals from applicants who do not have a current DUNS and Sam number. Both of those registration processes can be time-consuming. So even if you were just considering a proposal, I would recommend checking right now if you are going to have an up to date and current DUNS and Sam, DUNS number and Sam registration, because it can take some time to get those. And it has to be up to date at the time of submission, has to be up to date at the time of award, in order to actually receive a grant.

Make sure you understand those issues. You also have to have an authorized official registered at grants.gov, someone who is registered within the system and recognized as the person who can submit the application. So all three of those processes can be time-consuming. Make sure you understand what is involved. Every year, every cycle, we receive some rather sad stories, and E-mails from people, who said

it's 11:35 on Monday night, and the grant is due in 25 minutes, we don't know who is our authorized official on grants.gov. Unfortunately, we don't know, either. So there is really nothing we can do. Absolutely nothing we can do. You must have this in place, and only you are in a position to make that work.

Again, I want to suggest or recommend that you understand that we can only make grants to eligible applicants. Again, you can have ineligible partners, but the applicant itself has to fit the eligibility criteria we have outlined. We can only make grants to eligible applicants that submit complete applications on or before the deadline.

Complete means all required components. If you lack even one component, one document that is required and described in the Notification of Funding Opportunity, we have to reject your application. That is not within our authority to accept incomplete applications, and we cannot accept even complete applications submitted after the deadline. So eligibility, completeness, meet the deadline. Again, this is all out of our control. We are governed by mandates requiring consistent equitable treatment to all applicants. So we cannot make exceptions, which would be basically favoring one applicant over

another. So make sure you understand that process.

So, that's the end of the prepared presentation. So I'm ready to answer any questions, and one has come up. How should the partnership be documented in the two-page proposal? What I think you, obviously, without providing any attachments, you are not submitting formal letters of agreement and commitment, so I would suggest two things.

One, be reasonable, that you really want to be able to say the partners you have are actually, have either said, you can say I've talked to X, Y and Z, and they have all agreed to be part of this. Or alternatively you can say we think this would be strengthened by partnership with XY and Z and we plan to talk to them. That gives us a good idea of where you are in the development phase and we would certainly, I've certainly seen reviewers' comments that say not only should they talk to XYZ, they should talk to AB and C as well. The whole idea behind this process is that we are going to help you strengthen a full proposal. Make clear what you have done and what is still in a aspirational sense, and then be prepared to work into your proposal, your full proposal the suggestions that reviewers provide.

What is one-to-one matching? Can you please repeat? Technical difficulties. Basically, a match is a requirement again for any project grant over \$250,000.

And what that means is that the applicant or the applicant's partners are providing an equal contribution to the project. If you are asking for \$500,000 from the IMLS what you are saying in terms of a match is that you are providing at least \$500,000 worth of a match. It could be an in-kind match, which is a match of staff time, of various kinds of resources, of advisory board -- I mean, there is a whole variety of examples, and we would be happy to talk to you about specific questions you might have.

But it's not necessarily a dollar for dollar in a sense you have to give exactly \$500,000 in cold hard cash. But it can and most often is a variety of in-kind contributions. Or sometimes we often see indirect costs are waived, or applied, in the sense if you have a indirect cost agreement with a federal agency, that says we can request, whatever the percentage is, 33 percent of a grant, and apply it into indirect cost, which essentially go to the institution, rather than to the project, we very often see matches in terms of we are going to waive a percentage of that, or all of it, and provide that as a match.

Are you able to give examples of successful projects in those categories you mentioned? I am especially interested in what is considered a good project regarding learning spaces and digital platform.

Unfortunately, no, because we just defined those in the past year, and we have not yet made awards in the first cycle of applications. I can't point to a specific proposal within that framework, or I won't be able to point to a specific successful application within that framework until we make awards in, I think it is going to be March. March is our planned date for proposals submitted in the current National Leadership Grant Laura Bush cycle. I'm happy to talk to you about issues, again. Many possibilities are discussed in the convenings, that is probably the best source you can look for information about what is considered important or critical in those areas.

But until we actually make an award, in this early 2015 cycle, I can't point to a successful proposal. Under digital platform (indecipherable) of content. Basically, what we are saying is the National Leadership Grant program is looking to advance the profession. And from our perspective, and what we hear in the convenings, is that straightforward digitization projects have been pretty well explored, the techniques, the practices, the capacity necessary to digitize content of many, many different kinds, has been funded by IMLS in the past, by NEH, HPRC, variety of projects under way, which means that it's no longer unexplored territory. And that we expect at this point in time that libraries, archives, any kind of

applicant who is looking simply to digitize content, not to develop a new tool around it, not to use it with a new audience, not to connect it to particular learning goals, digitization of content proposals are not going to move us forward. Those are best done either with grants from other funding agencies that are interested in or ideally the applicant institution itself is already making decisions about its priorities and allocating resources on its own.

If the project doesn't fit into one of the project categories but does explore one of the issues IMLS is interested in, can you suggest ways to strengthen that proposal, would asking for less money help? Let me start with the last one. A planning grant is always of interest, if you have any kind of doubts about what you are doing and you are not really sure how to go forward an implementation grant or project grant at this point, say you have an interesting topic but you are looking for, looking to explore various opportunities with partnerships, planning grant is a good way to go. I'd say in one way, if you are thinking you are not sure of yourself and you are not certain about asking for less money, consider a planning grant. Asking for less money just by itself can often be, how would you say, counterproductive, because the reviewers are going to look at a proposal and say that is a \$500,000 project they are planning to do for

\$200,000. And then the response is going to be, it can't be done. Something is wrong with the work plan. Something is lacking in the expertise of the applicant. You always want to ask for the appropriate amount.

Again, I think the most important criterion you want to address, whatever the purpose of the goal, of the project or whatever goal you are trying to achieve, is impact. You are demonstrating that what you are going to achieve is going to have a broader impact beyond the single applicant institution, and the broader the impact, the more competitive the proposal is going to be. And how you actually define that is going to be different from topic to topic. Again, if you have any questions about specific ideas, contact one of the program staff. We can help you work it out.

Is it still the case in the cycle that equipment for a new learning space cannot be part of the funding request? This again goes to the question of impact. We are not by statute allowed to support construction or renovation of buildings. So if you are saying, we are interested in a learning space, but we don't have a proposal that is really going to address a specific issue that will move the profession forward, we just want a learning space, that has a very limited impact.

So, and it probably entails some unallowable costs within the proposal itself. So yeah, if you are just looking to build a learning space, that is a decision you

should be able to make on your own. Because what we are exploring are the projects that will help you make those decisions, and we are unable, simply because of lack of funds, the statutes that define how, what we can actually fund, we are unable to support building a learning space in every library and museum that wants one. That is a regrettable fact of life. The more competitive proposals are going to have broader impact.

Can you give examples of partners, are CBOs and commercial partners okay, or schools, as examples. The value of partners are going to vary from project to project. The best example I can give you is, say if you are looking at a technology project, a national digital platform project, and your institution has an idea and a specific set of expertise and skills. Technology projects very often involve a whole variety of different components from development of websites, to preservation of storage capacity, to communication and outreach activities, to use of specific tools.

I don't know of any single institution that can do all of those things effectively and cost effectively on its own. You want to have the partners that can provide the skills, the resources, the credibility and capacity that you don't have. And those can be consultants and vendors. You can be paying them through a

contract. They can be partners that you are working with to a sub award. They can be advisors, individuals who are just helping out because of the interest in the issue.

It is going to vary from project to project and proposal to proposal. But again you are looking to complement the skills you have, what do they have that can help you do what you plan to do. And if you have specific questions, contact one of us.

We are interested in pursuing a digitization of a collection using crowdsourcing, would lending for this type of digitization be available. Not per se. Again, digitization has been pretty well explored. Crowdsourcing is a great idea. But what would make the project, again, what would make the project attractive is if you are moving the discussion about crowdsourcing forward.

Are you engaging a new community? Are you telling libraries and archives about new tools? Are you developing new metrics for success and community engagement for crowdsourcing? If you are just saying, and I'll be straightforward, if you are saying we have some things we want to digitize, and we can't describe it all ourselves, or we can't transcribe the content ourselves, so we want to do some crowdsourcing, that's been pretty well explored. That

is a decision you need to make about your own resources.

Again, the criterion of impact, how you move the profession forward, how you address the issues that are of concern of other libraries and institutions is critical.

We are out of questions. That is not too bad, because we have to absolutely close in a few minutes, because we have yet another webinar scheduled at 4:00.

So, what I would urge you to do is, if you have specific questions, contact one of us. I've listed all of the program staff related to National Leadership Grant program here. E-mail any one of us. All our contact information is also available on the IMLS website. So if you are not downloading this presentation, and you don't want to write rapidly down some complicated names, feel free to look at the contact information for IMLS staff at IMLS.gov.

It's a much simpler process to schedule an opportunity to talk, if you want to do that, than simply calling us, from the fact that like any bureaucracy, we are consumed with meetings and other complications on a day-to-day basis. So we are not often always available when you call. But if you can E-mail and schedule a time to chat with us, that would be great.

Any other questions, concerns? Going once.

Going twice. Thank you all for your time. And I look forward to hearing from you any and all questions are most welcome. We urge you to consider submitting a National Leadership Grant proposal, and we are committed to helping you make your proposals the most competitive we can. So do not hesitate to join us. Thank you very much. Have a happy holiday.

>> Recording stopped.

(end of webinar at 2:50 p.m. CST)

This text is being provided in a rough-draft Format. Communication Access Realtime Translation (CART) or captioning are provided in order to facilitate communication accessibility and may not be a totally verbatim record of the proceedings.